arXiv:1607.07253v3 [hep-th] 8 Dec 2016

On finite $N = 1, 2$ BRST transformations: Jacobians and Standard Model with gauge-invariant Gribov horizon*

A.A. Reshetnyak† and P.Yu. Moshin‡

Abstract

We review the concept and properties of finite field-dependent BRST and BRST-antiBRST transformations introduced in our recent study [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7] for gauge theories. Exact rules for calculating the Jacobian of a corresponding change of variables in the partition function are presented. Infrared peculiarities under R_ξ-gauges in the Yang–Mills theory and Standard Model are examined in a gauge-invariant way with an appropriate horizon functional and unaffected local $N = 1, 2$ BRST symmetries.

1 Introduction

BRST transformations [8, 9] for gauge theories in Lagrangian formalism with a *field-dependent (FD)* Grassmann parameter μ were considered for the first time within the BV method [10] in the infinitesimal case, so as to prove the invariance of the partition function Z_Ψ: $Z_\Psi = Z_{\Psi+\delta\Psi}$ with respect to small variations of the gauge (in terms of the gauge fermion Ψ) under the choice $\mu = -\frac{i}{\hbar}\delta\Psi$. FD BRST transformations in the case of a *finite* functional parameter were introduced in Yang–Mills (YM) theories, within the family of generalized R_ξ-gauges [11], as a sequence of infinitesimal FD BRST transformations. Developed initially as a special $N = 1$ SUSY transformation, and being a change of the field variables $\phi^A \to \phi^{A\prime} = \phi^A + \delta_\mu\phi^A$ in the integrand of $Z_\Psi = \int d\phi \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}S_\Psi(\phi)\right\}$ with a quantum action $S_\Psi(\phi)$, BRST transformations were extended by means of antiBRST transformations [12, 13] in YM theories to the case of $N = 2$ BRST (BRST-antiBRST) transformations (in YM [14] and general gauge theories [15]), parametrized by an Sp(2) doublet of Grassmann parameters, μ_a, $a = 1, 2$.

The study of [16], which suggested to analyze so-called *soft BRST symmetry breaking* in YM theories, with account taken of the Gribov problem [17] in the infrared region of field configurations, discussed in the Zwanziger recipe [18] by adding a BRST-non-invariant horizon functional H to the quantum action, attracted the attention of A.A.R. (whose e-mail communication of 11.03.2011 initiated the joint study [19] together with P.M. Lavrov and O. Lechtenfeld). Among the results of [19] in the field-antifield formalism related to [16], an equation was derived in softly broken BRST symmetry (SB BRST) for a bosonic term

*Talk presented at SFP'16, 06 June – 11 June, 2016, TSU, Tomsk, Russia

†Institute of Strength Physics and Materials Science of SB RAS, 634021, Tomsk, Russia; e-mail: reshet@ispms.tsc.ru

‡Tomsk State University, Department of Physics, 634050, Tomsk, Russia; e-mail: moshin@phys.tsu.ru

$M(\phi,\phi^*)$ added to the quantum action $S_\Psi(\phi,\phi^*)$ of a general gauge theory. The validity of this equation, involving the generating functional of Green's functions $Z_{\Psi,M}(J,\phi^*)$ depending on sources J_A, preserves the gauge-independence of the respective vacuum functional $Z_{\Psi,M}(0)$ and the effective action, depending on external antifields, $\Gamma_M=\Gamma_M(\phi,\phi^*)$, and evaluated on the extremals,

$$\Big[M_A(\tfrac{\hbar}{\imath}\overrightarrow{\partial}_{(J)},\phi^*)\Big(\overrightarrow{\partial}^{*A}-\tfrac{\imath}{\hbar}M^{*A}(\tfrac{\hbar}{\imath}\overrightarrow{\partial}_J,\phi^*)\Big)\delta\Psi(\tfrac{\hbar}{\imath}\overrightarrow{\partial}_{(J)})+\delta M(\tfrac{\hbar}{\imath}\overrightarrow{\partial}_{(J)},\phi^*)\Big]Z_{\Psi,M}(J,\phi^*)=0 \quad (1)$$

$$\Longrightarrow Z_{\Psi,M}(0)=Z_{\Psi+\delta\Psi,M+\delta M}(0) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta\Gamma_M\big|_{\Gamma_{M,A}=0}=0,\ \Gamma_{M,A}=\Gamma_M\overleftarrow{\frac{\delta}{\delta\phi^A}}=\Gamma_M\overleftarrow{\partial}_A, \quad (2)$$

$$\text{with } Z_{\Psi,M}(J,\phi^*)=\int d\phi\exp\big\{\tfrac{\imath}{\hbar}(S_\Psi(\phi,\phi^*)+M(\phi,\phi^*)+J_A\phi^A)\big\} \text{ and } \Gamma_M=\tfrac{\hbar}{\imath}\ln Z-J_A\phi^A, \quad (3)$$

where it is assumed that $[M_A,M^{*A}]\equiv[M\overleftarrow{\partial}_A,\overrightarrow{\partial}^{*A}M]$, and $\phi^A=\frac{\hbar}{\imath}\overrightarrow{\partial}^A_{(J)}\ln Z$ are average fields. (1) has the same form when the horizon functional $H(A)$ for YM fields $A^{\mu n}(x)$ is used as $M(\phi,\phi^*)$. In terms of the vacuum expectation value, in the presence of external sources J_A and with a given gauge Ψ, relation (1) acquires the form

$$\big\langle\delta M+M\overleftarrow{s}\tfrac{\imath}{\hbar}\delta\Psi(\phi)\big\rangle=\big\langle\delta M-M\overleftarrow{s}\mu(\delta\Psi)\big\rangle=0,\ \text{for}\ \overleftarrow{s}=\overleftarrow{\partial}_A\overrightarrow{\partial}^{*A}S_\Psi:\delta_\mu\phi^A\equiv\phi^A\overleftarrow{s}\mu, \quad (4)$$

with $\overleftarrow{s}$ being the generator of BRST transformations. In fact, the horizon functional in the family of R_ξ-gauges for small ξ was derived explicitly in [19] by Eq. (5.20) therein. By using FD BRST transformations with a small odd-valued parameter, this was established in [1]. A.A.R. drew the attention of his coauthors (communication of 05.12.2011 to P.M. Lavrov) in [19] to the study of [20] which attempted to use FD BRST transformations [11] for relating the vacuum functionals of YM and GZ (Gribov–Zwanziger) theories in the same gauge. Explicit calculations of the functional Jacobian for a change of variables induced by FD BRST transformations in YM theories with a finite parameter μ were made in [21] so as to establish the gauge-independence of $Z_{\Psi,M}|_{M=0}$ under a finite change of the gauge.

The present article reviews the study of finite $N=1,2$ BRST transformations (including the case of FD parameters) and the way they influence the properties of the quantum action and path integral in conventional quantization. We suggest a quantum action for the YM theory and the Standard Model with an $N=1,2$ BRST-invariant horizon functional in terms of gauge-invariant transverse fields $(A^h)^n_\mu(x)$, with the initial BRST symmetry under R_ξ-gauges, in a way different from the recipe of [22]. We use the DeWitt condensed notation and the conventions of [1, 2], e.g., $\epsilon(F)$, $\overleftarrow{\partial}^A$, $\overrightarrow{\partial}^*_A$ and $\overrightarrow{\partial}^A_{(J)}$ are used to denote the respective value of the Grassmann parity of a quantity F and derivatives with respect to (anti)field variables ϕ^A,ϕ^*_A and sources J_A. The raising and lowering of Sp (2) indices, $\big(\overleftarrow{s}^a,\overleftarrow{s}_a\big)=\big(\varepsilon^{ab}\overleftarrow{s}_b,\varepsilon_{ab}\overleftarrow{s}^b\big)$, are carried out by the antisymmetric tensor ε^{ab}, $\varepsilon^{ac}\varepsilon_{cb}=\delta^a_b$, $\varepsilon^{12}=1$.

2 $N=1,2$ finite BRST transformations

Finite FD BRST transformations for the integrand in (3) at $J=M=0$

$$\delta_\mu\phi^A\equiv\phi^A\overleftarrow{s}_e,\quad \overleftarrow{s}_e=\overleftarrow{\partial}_AS^{*A}_\Psi \text{ with } (\overleftarrow{s}_e)^2=\overleftarrow{\partial}_A(S^{*A}_\Psi\overleftarrow{\partial}_B)S^{*B}_\Psi\neq0, \quad (5)$$

with a finite Grassmann parameter $\mu(\phi,\phi^*)$, depending on external antifields ϕ^*_A, $\epsilon(\phi^*_A)+1=\epsilon(\phi^A)=\epsilon_A$, and internal fields[1] ϕ^A, were introduced in [1] and made it possible to solve

[1]The variables ϕ^A contain the classical fields A^i, $i=1,..,n$, with gauge transformations $\delta A^i=R^i_\alpha(A)\xi^\alpha$, $\alpha=1,..,m<n$, as well as the ghost, antighost, and Nakanishi–Lautrup fields $C^\alpha,\bar{C}^\alpha,B^\alpha$,

the problem of SB BRST symmetry in general gauge theories. The master equation for S_Ψ, $\Delta \exp\left\{\frac{\imath}{\hbar} S_\Psi\right\} = 0$ with $\Delta = (-1)^{\epsilon_A} \overrightarrow{\partial}_A \overrightarrow{\partial}^{*A}$, reflects the absence of nilpotency for the generator $\overleftarrow{s}_e$, which reduces at $\phi^* = 0$ to the usual generator $\overleftarrow{s}$ of BRST transformations.

Construction of finite $N = 2$ BRST Lagrangian transformations solving the same problem within a suitable quantization scheme (starting from YM theories) was problematic in view of BRST-antiBRST-non-invariance for the gauge-fixed quantum action S_F in a form more than linear in μ_a, $S_F(g_l(\mu_a)\phi) = S_F(\phi) + O(\mu_1\mu_2)$, with the gauge condition encoded by a gauge boson $F(\phi)$. This problem was solved by finite $N = 2$ BRST transformations in an Abelian supergroup form, $\{g(\mu_a)\}$, using an appropriate set of variables Γ^p, according to [2]

$$\left\{G\left(\Gamma g(\mu_a)\right) = G\left(\Gamma\right) \text{ and } G\overleftarrow{s}^a = 0\right\} \Rightarrow g\left(\mu_a\right) = 1 + \overleftarrow{s}^a\mu_a + \tfrac{1}{4}\overleftarrow{s}^2\mu^2 = \exp\left\{\overleftarrow{s}^a\mu_a\right\}, \quad (6)$$

where $G(\Gamma)$ is an arbitrary regular functional; $\mu^2 \equiv \mu_a\mu^a$, $\overleftarrow{s}^2 \equiv \overleftarrow{s}^a\overleftarrow{s}_a$, and $\overleftarrow{s}^a$ are the generators of BRST-antiBRST transformations[2] in the space of Γ^p.

In YM theories, the construction of finite $N = 2$ BRST transformations (6) uses an explicit form of generators $\overleftarrow{s}^a$ (satisfying $\{\overleftarrow{s}^a, \overleftarrow{s}^b\} = 0$) in the space of fields $\phi^A = (A^i, C^\alpha, \bar{C}^\alpha, B^\alpha)$ arranged in Sp(2)-symmetric tensors, $(A^i, C^{\alpha a}, B^\alpha) = \left(A^{\mu m}, C^{ma}, B^m\right)$, as follows [2]:

$$S_F(\phi) = S_0(A) - \tfrac{1}{2}F_\xi\overleftarrow{s}^2, \; S_0(A) = -\tfrac{1}{4}\int d^Dx\, G^m_{\mu\nu}G^{m\mu\nu}, \; G^m_{\mu\nu} = \partial_{[\mu}A^m_{\nu]} + f^{mnl}A^n_\mu A^l_\nu, \quad (7)$$

$$F_\xi(\phi) = \tfrac{1}{2}\int d^Dx \left(-A^m_\mu A^{m\mu} + \tfrac{\xi}{2}\varepsilon_{ab}C^{ma}C^{mb}\right) \Leftrightarrow R_\xi - \text{gauges}, \quad (8)$$

$$\Delta A^m_\mu = D^{mn}_\mu C^{na}\mu_a - \tfrac{1}{2}\left(D^{mn}_\mu B^n + \tfrac{1}{2}f^{mnl}C^{la}D^{nk}_\mu C^{kb}\varepsilon_{ba}\right)\mu^2, \quad (9)$$

$$\Delta B^m = -\tfrac{1}{2}\left(f^{mnl}B^lC^{na} + \tfrac{1}{6}f^{mnl}f^{lrs}C^{sb}C^{ra}C^{nc}\varepsilon_{cb}\right)\mu_a, \quad (10)$$

$$\Delta C^{ma} = \left(\varepsilon^{ab}B^m - \tfrac{1}{2}f^{mnl}C^{la}C^{nb}\right)\mu_b - \tfrac{1}{2}\left(f^{mnl}B^lC^{na} + \tfrac{1}{6}f^{mnl}f^{lrs}C^{sb}C^{ra}C^{nc}\varepsilon_{cb}\right)\mu^2, \quad (11)$$

for $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \mathrm{diag}(-,+,\ldots,+)$ and the totally antisymmetric $su(\hat{N})$ structure constants f^{mnl}, $l, m, n = 1, \ldots, \hat{N}^2 - 1$).[3] In general gauge theories, such as reducible theories or theories with an open gauge algebra, the corresponding space of triplectic variables $\Gamma^p_{tr} = (\phi^A, \phi^*_{Aa}, \bar{\phi}_A, \pi^{Aa}, \lambda^A)$ in the Sp(2)-covariant Lagrangian quantization scheme [15] contains, in addition to ϕ^A, also 3 sets of antifields ϕ^*_{Aa}, $\bar{\phi}_A$, $\epsilon(\phi^*_{Aa}, \bar{\phi}_A) = (\epsilon_A + 1, \epsilon_A)$, as sources to BRST, antiBRST and mixed BRST-antiBRST transformations, and 3 sets of Lagrangian multipliers π^{Aa}, λ^A, $\epsilon(\pi^{Aa}, \lambda^A) = (\epsilon_A + 1, \epsilon_A)$, introducing the gauge. The corresponding generating functional of Green's functions, $Z_F(J) = \int \mathcal{I}^{(F)}_{\Gamma_{tr}}(J)$, with the bosonic functional $W(\phi, \phi^*_a, \bar{\phi})$ being related to the gauge-invariant classical action $S_0(A)$ as $W(\phi, 0, 0) = S_0(A)$,

$$Z_F(J) = \int d\Gamma \exp\left\{\left(\imath/\hbar\right)\left[W + \phi^*_a\pi^a + \bar{\phi}\lambda - \tfrac{1}{2}F\overleftarrow{U}^2 + J\phi\right]\right\}, \; \overleftarrow{U}^a = \overleftarrow{\partial}_A\pi^{Aa} + \varepsilon^{ab}\overleftarrow{\partial}^{(\pi)}_{Ab}\lambda^A, \quad (12)$$

is invariant at $J = 0$ with respect to finite $N = 2$ BRST transformations (for constant μ_a)

$\epsilon(A^i, \xi^\alpha, C^\alpha, \bar{C}^\alpha, B^\alpha) = \left(\epsilon_i, \epsilon_\alpha, \epsilon_\alpha + 1, \epsilon_\alpha + 1, \epsilon_\alpha\right)$, along with additional towers of fields, depending on the (ir)reducibility of the theory.

[2]The transformations $\Gamma^p \to \Gamma^p g(\mu_a)$, however, cannot be presented in terms of an exp-like relation for an Sp(2) doublet of functional parameters $\mu_a(\Gamma)$, due to $\mu_a\overleftarrow{s}_b \neq 0$.

[3]$N = 2$ and $N = 1$ BRST-invariant actions of YM theories coincide only in Landau gauge, $\xi = 0$.

in the space of Γ^p_{tr}, which are obtained from (6) with a functional $G_{tr} = G(\Gamma^p_{tr})$:

$$\Gamma^p_{tr} \to \Gamma'^p_{tr} = \Gamma^p_{tr}\left(1 + \overleftarrow{s}^a\mu_a + \tfrac{1}{4}\overleftarrow{s}^2\mu^2\right) \equiv \Gamma^p_{tr} g(\mu_a) \Longrightarrow \mathcal{I}^{(F)}_{\Gamma_{tr}g(\mu_a)}(0) = \mathcal{I}^{(F)}_{\Gamma_{tr}}(0), \tag{13}$$

$$\text{where } \overleftarrow{s}^a = \Big(\overleftarrow{\partial}_A, \overleftarrow{\partial}^{Aa}_{(\phi^*)}, \overleftarrow{\partial}^A_{(\bar\phi)}, \overleftarrow{\partial}^{(\pi)}_{Ab}\Big)\Big(\pi^{Aa}, W_{,A}(-1)^{\epsilon_A}, \varepsilon^{ab}\phi^*_{Ab}(-1)^{\epsilon_A+1}, \varepsilon^{ab}\lambda^A\Big)^T, \{\overleftarrow{s}^a, \overleftarrow{s}^b\} \neq 0,$$

$$\text{provided that } \left(\Delta^a + (\imath/\hbar)\varepsilon^{ab}\phi^*_{Ab}\overrightarrow{\partial}^A_{(\bar\phi)}\right)\exp\Big\{\frac{\imath}{\hbar}W\Big\} = 0, \text{ for } \Delta^a = (-1)^{\epsilon_A}\overrightarrow{\partial}_A\overrightarrow{\partial}^{*Aa}. \tag{14}$$

3 Jacobians of FD $N = 1, 2$ BRST transformations

The Jacobian induced by a change of variables $\phi^A \to \phi'^A = \phi^A(1 + \overleftarrow{s}_e\mu)$ is given by [1]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Sdet}\Big\|\phi'^A\overleftarrow{\partial}_B\Big\| &= \exp\Big\{\mathrm{Str}\ln\Big(\delta^A_B + (S^{*A}_\Psi\mu)\overleftarrow{\partial}_B\Big)\Big\} = \exp\Big\{\mathrm{Str}\sum_{n=1}\frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n}\Big((S^{*A}_\Psi\mu)\overleftarrow{\partial}_B\Big)^n\Big\}\\ &= \big(1 + \mu\overleftarrow{s}_e\big)^{-1}\Big\{1 + \overleftarrow{s}_e\mu\Big\}\Big\{1 + \big(\Delta S_\Psi\big)\mu\Big\} = J_{\mu(\phi)}\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

and reduces, in a rank-1 theory with a closed gauge algebra, $[\Delta S_\Psi, \overleftarrow{s}^2] = [0, 0]$, where $\overleftarrow{s}_e = \overleftarrow{s}$, to the form $\mathrm{Sdet}\Big\|\Phi'^A\overleftarrow{\partial}_B\Big\| = \big(1 + \mu\overleftarrow{s}\big)^{-1}$, which is the same as in YM theories [21]. The Jacobian (15) allows one to solve the problem of SB BRST symmetry in general gauge theories [1] and was examined in detail [5] for an equivalent representation of $Z_{\Psi,M}(J, \phi^*)$ with BRST transformations $\Gamma^p \to \Gamma^{p\prime} = \Gamma^p(1 + \overleftarrow{s}\mu)$, for $\mu(\Gamma)$ and $\Gamma^p\overleftarrow{s} = (\phi^A, \tilde\phi^*_A, \lambda^A)\overleftarrow{s} = (\lambda^A, S\overleftarrow{\partial}_A, 0)$, in an extended space Γ^p of fields ϕ^A, internal antifields $\tilde\phi^*_A$, and Lagrangian multipliers λ^A for Abelian hypergauge conditions, $G_A(\phi, \phi^*) = \phi^*_A - \Psi(\phi)\overleftarrow{\partial}_A$, with the result

$$Z_{\psi,M}(J, \phi^*) = \int d\Gamma \exp\Big\{\tfrac{\imath}{\hbar}S(\phi, \tilde\phi^*) + \mathcal{G}_A\big(\phi, \tilde\phi^{*\prime} + \phi^*\big)\lambda^A + M(\phi, \phi^*) + J\phi\Big\}, \tag{16}$$

$$J^{BV}_{\mu(\Gamma)} = \mathrm{Sdet}\Big\|\Gamma^{p\prime}\overleftarrow{\partial}^\Gamma_q\Big\| = \big(1 + \mu\overleftarrow{s}\big)^{-1}\Big\{1 + \overleftarrow{s}\mu\Big\}\Big\{1 + \big(\Delta S\big)\mu\Big\}. \tag{17}$$

The Jacobian (17) coincides with (15), except for the U-exact term $\overleftarrow{U} = \overleftarrow{s}\big|_{\phi,\lambda}$, $\overleftarrow{U}^2 = 0$, with the hypergauge $G_A = (\phi^*_A\phi^A + \Psi)\overleftarrow{U}$, which is Δ-exact, thus making the Jacobian $J_{\mu(\phi)}$ unique.

We suggest a so-called *soft nilpotency condition*, $\tilde\mu(\overleftarrow{s}_e)^2 = 0$, for the parameter $\tilde\mu(\phi)$ which transforms the set of $G_w = \{g(\mu(\phi)) : \mu(\overleftarrow{s}_e)^2 = 0\}$ into a group with the Jacobian

$$J_{\tilde\mu(\phi)} = J_{\mu(\phi)}\big|_{G_w} = \big(1 + \mu\overleftarrow{s}_e\big)^{-1}\Big\{1 + \big(\Delta S_\Psi\big)\mu\Big\}, \tag{18}$$

being more general than in a rank-1 theory and formally identical with $J^{BV}_{\mu(\phi,\lambda)}$; see (17).

For $N = 2$ BRST transformations in YM theories, the technique of calculating the Jacobian was first examined in the case of functionally-dependent parameters $\mu_a = \Lambda(\phi)\overleftarrow{s}_a$

with an even-valued functional Λ in [2]. The result is given by, $\phi'^A \equiv \phi^A g(\Lambda(\phi)\overleftarrow{s}_a)$,

$$J_{\Lambda(\phi)\overleftarrow{s}_a} = \mathrm{Sdet}\left\|\phi'^A\overleftarrow{\partial}_B\right\| = \exp\left\{\mathrm{Str}\ln\left(\delta^A_B + M^A_B\right)\right\}, \quad \text{for} \quad M^A_B = P^A_B + Q^A_B + R^A_B \tag{19}$$

$$= \phi^A\overleftarrow{s}^a(\mu_a\overleftarrow{\partial}_B) + \mu_a\left[(\phi^A\overleftarrow{s}^a)\overleftarrow{\partial}_B - \tfrac{1}{2}(\phi^A\overleftarrow{s}^2)(\mu^a\overleftarrow{\partial}_B)\right](-1)^{\epsilon_A+1} + \tfrac{1}{4}\mu^2(\phi^A\overleftarrow{s}^2\overleftarrow{\partial}_B),$$

$$\mathrm{Str}(P+Q+R)^n = \mathrm{Str}(P+Q)^n + C^1_n\mathrm{Str}P^{n-1}R, \quad \text{for} \quad C^k_n = n!/k!(n-k)!, \tag{20}$$

$$\mathrm{Str}(P+Q)^n = \begin{cases} \mathrm{Str}P^n + n\mathrm{Str}P^{n-1}Q + C^2_n\mathrm{Str}P^{n-2}Q^2, \ n = 2,3, \\ \mathrm{Str}P^n + n\sum_{k=0}^2 \mathrm{Str}P^{n-k}Q^k + K_n\mathrm{Str}P^{n-3}QPQ, \ n > 3 \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

$$\Longrightarrow J_{\Lambda(\phi)\overleftarrow{s}_a} = \exp\Big\{\sum_{n=1}(-1)^{n-1}n^{-1}\mathrm{Str}(P^A_B)^n\Big\} = \left(1 - \tfrac{1}{2}\Lambda\overleftarrow{s}^2\right)^{-2}, \tag{22}$$

where $K_n = \left[\frac{n+1}{2} - 2\right]C^1_n + \big((n+1)\bmod 2\big)C^1_{\left[\frac{n}{2}\right]}$, with $[x]$ being the integer part of $x \in \mathbb{R}$. For functionally-independent FD parameters, $\mu_a(\phi) \neq \Lambda\overleftarrow{s}_a$, the above algorithm (19)–(22) involves a generalization of (21), examined separately for odd- and even-valued n, which leads to [6]

$$J_{\mu_a} = \exp\Big\{\mathrm{tr}\sum_{n=1}(-1)^{n-1}n^{-1}\mathrm{Str}(P^A_B)^n\Big\} = \exp\{-\mathrm{tr}\ln(e+m)\}, \ m^a_b = \mu_b\overleftarrow{s}^a, \tag{23}$$

where $(e)^a_b$ and tr denote δ^a_b and trace over Sp(2) indices. The Jacobian (23) is generally not BRST-antiBRST-exact; however, it is identical at $\mu_a = \Lambda\overleftarrow{s}_a$ with $J_{\Lambda\overleftarrow{s}_a}$ (22), due to $\mathrm{tr}\, m^a_b = -\Lambda\overleftarrow{s}^2$. In general gauge theories (12)–(14), the calculation of Jacobians induced by FD $N = 2$ BRST transformations was first carried out in [3, 5] with functionally-dependent parameters $\mu_a = \Lambda(\phi,\pi,\lambda)\overleftarrow{U}_a$, the restricted generators $\overleftarrow{U}^a = \overleftarrow{s}^a|_{\phi,\pi,\lambda}$ satisfying the algebra $\{\overleftarrow{U}^a, \overleftarrow{U}^b\} = 0$, and then in [6] with arbitrary parameters $\mu_a(\Gamma_{tr})$, including functionally-independent $\mu_a(\phi,\pi,\lambda)$. The result is given by

$$J_{\Lambda\overleftarrow{U}_a} = \mathrm{Sdet}\left\|\left[\Gamma^p_{tr}g(\Lambda\overleftarrow{U}_a)\right]\overleftarrow{\partial}^\Gamma_q\right\| = \exp\left[-(\Delta^a W)\,\mu_a - \tfrac{1}{4}(\Delta^a W)\,\overleftarrow{s}_a\mu^2\right]\left(1 - \tfrac{1}{2}\Lambda\overleftarrow{s}^2\right)^{-2}, \tag{24}$$

$$J_{\mu_a(\phi,\pi,\lambda)} = \exp\Big\{-(\Delta^a W)\,\mu_a - \tfrac{1}{4}(\Delta^a W)\,\overleftarrow{s}_a\mu^2 - \mathrm{tr}\,\ln(e+m)\Big\}, \tag{25}$$

$$J_{\mu_a(\Gamma_{tr})} = \exp\Big\{-\mathrm{tr}\,\ln(e+m)\Big\}g\big(\mu_a(\Gamma_{tr})\big)\exp\Big\{-(\Delta^a W)\mu_a - \tfrac{1}{4}(\Delta^a W)\overleftarrow{s}_a\mu^2\Big\}. \tag{26}$$

The group-like element $g\big(\mu_a(\Gamma_{tr})\big)$ in (26) draws a difference between the Jacobians $J_{\mu_a(\phi,\pi,\lambda)}$ and $J_{\mu_a(\Gamma_{tr})}$, because $\overleftarrow{s}_a$ are not reduced to the nilpotent $\overleftarrow{U}_a$ as they act on Γ^p_{tr}. In generalized Hamiltonian formalism, the Jacobians of corresponding FD BRST-antiBRST transformations were calculated from first principles by the rules (19)–(23) in [4, 6].

4 On soft nilpotency and gauge-independent Standard Model with GZ horizon

For FD parameters, finite BRST transformations allow one to obtain a new form of the Ward identity and to establish the gauge-independence of the path integral under a finite change of the gauge, $\Psi \to \Psi + \Psi'$, provided that the SB BRST symmetry term $M = M_\Psi$ transforms to $M_{\Psi+\Psi'} = M_\Psi(1 + \overleftarrow{s}\mu(\Psi'))$, with $\mu(\Psi')$ being a solution of a so-called compensation equation,

$$Z_{\Psi,M_\Psi}(0,\phi^*) = Z_{\Psi+\Psi',M_{\Psi+\Psi'}}(0,\phi^*) \Rightarrow \Psi'(\phi,\lambda|\mu) = \tfrac{\hbar}{i}\left[\textstyle\sum_{n=1}\frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{n}\,(\mu\overleftarrow{s}\,)^{n-1}\right]\mu, \tag{27}$$

for representations of the path integral (16). The Ward identity, depending on the FD parameter $\mu(\Psi') = -\frac{i}{\hbar}g(y)\Psi'$, for $g(z) = 1 - \exp\{z\}/z$, $z \equiv (i/\hbar)\Psi'\overleftarrow{s}$, and the gauge-dependence problem are described by the respective expressions [5]

$$\Big\langle\!\Big\langle 1 + \tfrac{i}{\hbar}\left[J_A\phi^A + M_\Psi\right]\overleftarrow{s}\,\mu(\Psi')\Big\}\,(1 + \mu(\Psi')\overleftarrow{s})^{-1}\Big\rangle_{\Psi,M,J} = 1 \text{ and } \Big\langle (J_A\phi^A + M_\Psi)\overleftarrow{s}\Big\rangle_{\Psi,M,J} = 0, \quad (28)$$

as one makes averaging with respect to $Z_{\Psi,M_\Psi}(J,\phi^*)$. The above equations are equivalent to those of [1] in the representation (3) if we restrict ourselves by the set G_w of $N = 1$ BRST transformations with soft nilpotency imposed on $\tilde{\mu}(\phi)$. Indeed, from (18) and (2.40) in [1], we find the compensation equation

$$\imath\hbar \ln\left(1 + \tilde{\mu}\overleftarrow{s}_e\right) = \left(\exp\left\{-[\Delta,\Psi']_+\right\} - 1\right)S_\Psi, \quad (29)$$

whose resolvability implies that its right-hand side should be

$$\overleftarrow{s}_e - \text{closed} : \left[\left(\exp\left\{-[\Delta,\Psi']_+\right\} - 1\right)S_\Psi\right]\overleftarrow{s}_e = 0. \quad (30)$$

For an infinitesimal change Ψ', this amounts to a *soft nilpotency condition*: $\Psi'(\overleftarrow{s}_e)^2 = 0$. For admissible changes of the gauge Ψ' satisfying this condition, the solution to (29) for an unknown $\tilde{\mu}$, with accuracy up to a total derivative $(F\overleftarrow{\partial}_A)$, has the form

$$\tilde{\mu}(\Psi'|\phi) = \frac{\Psi'}{\Psi'\overleftarrow{s}_e}\left[\exp\left\{\frac{\imath}{\hbar}\left(\exp\left\{-[\Delta,\Psi']_+\right\} - 1\right)S_\Psi\right\} - 1\right]. \quad (31)$$

This allows one to obtain a new form of Ward identity depending on $\tilde{\mu}(\Psi')$ and to specify gauge dependence, with simiar results developed in [1].

$N = 2$ FD BRST transformations solve the same problem under a finite change of the gauge, $F \to F + F'$, provided that the SB BRST-antiBRST symmetry term M_F transforms to $M_{F+F'} = M_F(1 + \overleftarrow{s}^a\mu_a(F') + \frac{1}{4}\overleftarrow{s}^2\mu^2(F'))$, with $\mu_a(F';\phi,\pi,\lambda) = \Lambda\overleftarrow{U}_a$ being a solution to the corresponding compensation equation based on (12):

$$Z_F(0) = Z_{F+F'}(0) \Rightarrow F'(\phi,\pi,\lambda|\mu_a) = 4\imath\hbar\left[\sum\nolimits_{n=1}\frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{2^n n}\left(\Lambda\overleftarrow{U}^2\right)^{n-1}\Lambda\right]. \quad (32)$$

As a result, the Ward identity with the FD parameters $\mu_a(F') = \frac{i}{2\hbar}g(z)F'\overleftarrow{U}_a$, $\Lambda(\Gamma|F') = \frac{i}{2\hbar}g(z)F'$ for $z \equiv (i/4\hbar)F'\overleftarrow{U}^2$, acquires the form [5]

$$\Big\langle\Big\{1 + \tfrac{i}{\hbar}J_A\phi^A\left[\overleftarrow{U}^a\mu_a(\Lambda) + \tfrac{1}{4}\overleftarrow{U}^2\mu^2(\Lambda)\right] - \tfrac{1}{4}\left(\tfrac{i}{\hbar}\right)^2 J_A\phi^A\overleftarrow{U}^a J_B(\phi^B)\overleftarrow{U}_a\mu^2(\Lambda)\Big\} \quad (33)$$
$$\times\left(1 - \tfrac{1}{2}\Lambda\overleftarrow{U}^2\right)^{-2}\Big\rangle_{F,J} = 1,$$

and allows one to solve the gauge-dependence problem [5] with a source-dependent average expectation value with respect to $Z_F(J)$, corresponding to a gauge-fixing $F(\phi)$.

Using the $N = 1,2$ SB BRST symmetry term $M(\phi)$ as the horizon functional $H(A)$ [18],

$$H(A) = \gamma^2\int d^Dx\big(d^Dy f^{mnk}A^n_\mu(x)(K^{-1})^{ml}(x,y)f^{ljk}A^{j\mu}(y) \;+\; D(\hat{N}^2 - 1)\big) \quad (34)$$

with the inverse Faddeev–Popov operator $(K^{-1})^{mn}(x,z)$ in Landau gauge, the Gribov mass γ, and gauge-independent $Z_{H,\Psi}$, $Z_{H,F}$ in (27), (32), we find in a new gauge

$$H_{\Psi'}(\phi) = H(A)\left\{1 + \overleftarrow{s}\,\mu(\Psi')\right\} \text{ or } H_{F'}(\phi) = H(A)\left\{1 + \overleftarrow{s}^a\mu_a(F') + \tfrac{1}{4}\overleftarrow{s}^2\mu^2(F')\right\}. \quad (35)$$

At the same time, we can suggest a new $N = 1$ or $N = 2$ BRST-invariant and gauge-independent extension of YM theory, by using a gauge-invariant horizon $H(A^h) = H(A)\big|_{A\to A^h}$ in terms of gauge- and BRST-invariant transverse fields $A^h_\mu = (A^h)^n_\mu T^n$, with $su(\hat{N})$ generators T^n and a coupling constant g; see [23]:

$$A_\mu = A^h_\mu + A^L_\mu : A^h_\mu = (\eta_{\mu\nu} - \tfrac{\partial_\mu\partial_\nu}{\partial^2})\Big(A^\nu - \imath g\big[\tfrac{\partial A}{\partial^2}, A^\nu - \tfrac{1}{2}\partial^\nu\tfrac{\partial A}{\partial^2}\big]\Big) + \mathcal{O}(A^3) : \; A^h_\mu \overleftarrow{s} = 0, \quad (36)$$

$$H(A) = H(A^h) + \gamma^2 \int d^D x\, d^D y\; R^m(A, \partial A, \partial_x; x, y)\partial^\mu A^m_\mu(y), \quad H(A^h)\overleftarrow{s} = 0, \quad (37)$$

with a non-local function $R^m(x, y)$ in [22]. The structure of the second term in $H(A)$ allows one to add it to the gauge term $B^m(\partial^\mu A^m_\mu)$ in the Faddeev–Popov action $S_0 + \Psi\overleftarrow{s}$ (or the $N = 2$ BRST action S_F), in such a way that the change of variables in $Z_{H,\Psi}$ is a shift, $B^m \to B^m + \gamma^2 R^m$, with the unity Jacobian completely eliminating the dependence on the SB BRST symmetry term in $Z_{H,\Psi}$. Therefore, the action

$$\hat{S}_{GZ}(\phi) = S_0 + \int d^D x(\bar{C}^m\partial^\mu A^m_\mu)\overleftarrow{s} + H(A^h), \text{ for } \phi^A\overleftarrow{s} = (D^{mn}_\mu C^n, -\tfrac{1}{2}f^{mnl}C^l C^n, B^m, 0) \quad (38)$$

provides the gauge-independence in the YM theory and Standard Model [6] under R_ξ-gauges, with the same Faddeev–Popov operator $(K)^{mn}(x, y)$ and unaffected $N = 1$ (with $\Psi\overleftarrow{s}$ replaced by $-\frac{1}{2}F_\xi\overleftarrow{s}^{\,2}$, in (38) for $N = 2$) BRST symmetry, for which one may expect the unitarity of the theory within the Faddeev–Popov quantization rules [24]. The same results concerning the problems of unitarity and gauge-independence may be achieved within the local formulation of Gribov–Zwanziger theory [18] when the horizon functional is localized by means of a quartet of auxiliary fields $\phi_{\rm aux} = \big(\varphi^{mn}_\mu, \bar{\varphi}^{mn}_\mu;\, \omega^{mn}_\mu, \bar{\omega}^{mn}_\mu\big)$, having opposite Grasmann parities, $\epsilon(\varphi, \bar{\varphi}) = \epsilon(\omega, \bar{\omega}) + 1 = 0$, and being antisymmetric in m, n:

$$\hat{S}_{\rm GZ}(\phi, \phi_{\rm aux}) \;=\; S_0(A) + \int d^D x(\bar{C}^m\partial^\mu A^m_\mu)\overleftarrow{s} + S_\gamma(A^h, \phi_{\rm aux}) \;, \quad (39)$$

$$S_\gamma \;=\; \int d^D x\Big(\bar{\varphi}^{mn}_\mu K^{ml}(A^h)\varphi^{\mu ln} - \bar{\omega}^{mn}_\mu K^{ml}(A^h)\omega^{\mu ln} + \gamma\, f^{mnl}(A^h)^{\mu m}(\varphi^{nl}_\mu - \bar{\varphi}^{nl}_\mu) + \gamma^2 D(\hat{N}^2 - 1)\Big) \;. \quad (40)$$

The part S_γ additional to the Faddeev–Popov action is explicitly $N = 1$ BRST invariant, because of a trivial (vanishing) definition of $N = 1$ ($N = 2$) BRST transformations for the auxiliary fields: $\phi_{\rm aux}\overleftarrow{s} = 0$ ($\phi_{\rm aux}\overleftarrow{s}^{\,a} = 0$).[4]

Notice in conclusion that $N = 1, 2$ FD BRST transformations make it possible to study their explicit influence on the Standard Model, reducible theoriess (such as the Freedman–Townsend model), the concept of average effective action [1, 2, 3, 5, 6], and also allow one to extend themselves to the case of $N = m$ BRST transformations for arbitrary $m > 2$, along the lines of [25].

Acknowledgments The authors are grateful to the participants of the International Workshop "Strong Field Problems in Quantum Field Theory" (June 06–11, 2016, Tomsk, Russia) for discussions. A.A.R. thanks A.D. Pereira for useful correspondence. The study of P.Yu.M. is supported by the Tomsk State University Competitiveness Improvement Program.

[4]These results were obtained in June 2016, but were not included in the SFP'16 Proceedings due to the limitations for a paper volume.

References

[1] Reshetnyak A. // Int. J. Mod. Phys. A. 2014. V. 29. P. 1450128.

[2] Moshin P.Yu., Reshetnyak A.A. // Nucl. Phys. B. 2014. V. 888. P. 92–128.

[3] Moshin P.Yu., Reshetnyak A.A. // Phys. Lett. B. V. 739. P. 110–117.

[4] Moshin, P.Yu., Reshetnyak, A.A. // Int. J. Mod. Phys. A. 2014. V. 29. P. 1450159.

[5] Moshin P.Yu., Reshetnyak A.A. // Int. J. Mod. Phys. A. 2015. V. 30. P. 1550021.

[6] Moshin P.Yu., Reshetnyak A.A. // Int. J. Mod. Phys. A. 2016. V. 31. P. 1650111.

[7] Moshin P.Yu., Reshetnyak A.A., *Comparative analysis of finite field-dependent BRST transformations* // [arXiv: 1604.03027 [hep-th]].

[8] Becchi C., Rouet A., Stora R. // Phys. Lett. B. 1974. V. 52. P. 344–346.

[9] Tyutin I.V. // Lebedev Inst. preprint. 1975. No. 39.

[10] Batalin I.A., Vilkovisky G.A. // Phys. Lett. B. 1981. V. 102. P. 27–31.

[11] Joglekar S.D., Mandal B.P. // Phys. Rev. D. 1995. V. 51 P. 1919–1928.

[12] Curci G., Ferrari R. // Phys. Lett. B. 1976. V. 63. P. 91–94.

[13] Alvarez-Gaume L., Baulieu L. // Nucl. Phys. B. 1983. V. 212. P. 255–267.

[14] Spiridonov V.P. // Nucl. Phys. B. 1988. V. 308. P. 527–543.

[15] Batalin I.A., Lavrov P.M., Tyutin I.V. // J. Math. Phys. 1990. V. 31. P. 1487–1493.

[16] Capri M., Gomes A.J., Guimaraes M.S. et al. // Phys. Rev. D. 2011. V. 83. P.105001.

[17] Gribov V.N. // Nucl. Phys. B. 1978. V. 139. P. 1–19.

[18] Zwanziger D. // Nucl. Phys. B. 1989. V. 323. P. 513–544.

[19] Lavrov P., Lechtenfeld O., Reshetnyak A. // JHEP. 2011. V. 1110. P. 043.

[20] Upadhyay S., Mandal B.P. // AIP. Conf. Proc. 2011. V. 1444. P. 213–219.

[21] Lavrov P., Lechtenfeld O. // Phys. Lett. B. 2013. V. 725. P. 382–385; 386–388.

[22] Capri M., Dudal D., P. Sorella et al. // Phys. Rev. D. 2015. V. 92. P. 045039.

[23] Semenov-Tyan-Shanskii M., Franke V. // Zap. Nauch. Sem. LOMI im. V.A. Steklov, AN SSSR 120 (1982) 159 (English translation: New York: Plenum Press 1986).

[24] Faddeev L.D., Popov V.N. // Phys. Lett. B. 1967. V. 25. P.29–31.

[25] Upadhyay S., Reshetnyak A.A., Mandal B.P. // Eur. Phys. J. C. 2016. V. 76. P. 391. [arxiv:1605.02973[physics.gen-ph]].